<center>**REMARKS**</center>

1.   Summary of the Office Action

In the office action mailed May 13, 2009, the Examiner objected to claims 7-9, rejected

claims 1, 4-10, and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over United States

Patent Pub. No. 2001/0034709 (Stoifo), and rejected claims 2-3 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as being unpatentable over Stoifo in view of Applicant admitted prior art (AAPA).

2.   Status of the Claims

Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 8, 9, and 10 in order to clarify the terms of the

claims. New claims 16-19 are currently added. Accordingly, presently pending are claims 1-19,

of which claims 1, 7, 8, and 10 are independent, and the remainder dependent.

3.   Response to Rejections

     i.   The Examiner's rejection of Claims 1, 4-10, and 13-15 should be withdrawn.

The Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit has held that "A claim is anticipated only if

each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently

described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814

F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). As discussed more fully in the following

sections, Applicants submit that the Stoifo reference fails to anticipate each and every element of

the currently claimed invention as set forth in independent claims 1, 7, 8, and 10.

First, Applicants submit that the Stoifo reference fails to disclose a "system for handling

email requests for sending and receiving email from a terminal." The Examiner relies upon

Stoifo's disclosure of using a user's "true e-mail address" to identify a user at a computer 101 to

read on this claim limitation. However, the use of an e-mail address to identify a user is not

equivalent to handling email requests for sending and receiving e-mail from a terminal.

Additionally, paragraph [0024] of Stoifo, discloses that "a user may register a long-term proxy identity with the trusted third party so that the Web site may from time to time contact the anonymous user via a proxy email address assigned by the trusted third party." However, there is no disclosure in Stoifo regarding a relation between maintaining a proxy email address at the third party and handling e-mail send and receive requests from the user computer 101. Applicants submit that, for example, the third party maintaining a web interface in which a user may access e-mail stored sent to the proxy email address and stored at the third party is entirely consistent with the Stoifo disclosure, and does not read upon the claim limitations requiring a "system for handling email requests for sending and receiving email from a terminal."

See, for example, paragraph [0005] of Stoifo, which discloses that the "...invention provides for browsing Web pages provided by a Web server computer anonymously and privately. Further, the present invention allows messages to be exchanged between the user computer and the Web server computer. In particular, a trusted third party entity (i.e., a private portal server computer) registers true identity information of a user (e.g., e-mail addresses, IP address, URL, Web identification, etc.) and provides to the user a proxy identity for use when browsing the Web pages of the Web server computer..."

In addition, see paragraph [0011] of Stoifo that states "...A user at user computer 101 can browse Web pages at Web server computer 103 anonymously and privately by sending a message to private portal computer 107 requesting that the Web pages at Web server computer 103 be downloaded to user computer 101...Further, the message is written in a browser language such as hypertext markup language (HTML), extensible markup language (XML) or other browser language available to one of ordinary skill in the art."

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Tel: 312-903-0001
Facsimile: 312-913-0002

9

The use of mail requests (for example, SMTP and POP-3 requests) is simply not equivalent to HTML or XML-based HTTP messages.

For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 7, 8, and 10 be withdrawn, and these claims allowed to issue.

Second, Applicants submit that the Stoifo reference fails to disclose "at least one email proxy and a database, the email proxy being configured to communicate with the database." As stated earlier, Stoifo is directed to an HTTP/Web-based proxy, and fails to disclose of suggest acting as an e-mail proxy for email requests such as POP3 or SMTP based messages.

Third, Applicants submit that the Stoifo reference fails to disclose "wherein the email proxy is configured to detect a unique network address of the terminal." Stoifo's disclosure of a user providing a "true identification" such as an IP address is not equivalent to an email proxy device actually detecting the network address of the terminal itself. In Stoifo's case, the user must provide this information, which defeats the entire purpose of automatic detection, reducing the amount of input required from the user. In contrast, and as set forth in the currently pending claims, Applicant's currently claimed invention detects a unique network address of the terminal automatically, without requiring further input or messaging from a user.

Fourth, Applicants submit that the Stoifo reference fails to disclose "retriev[ing] email configuration settings from the database using the unique network address of the terminal." As set forth on page 2 of Applicant's disclosure, e-mail configuration settings include, for example, an e-mail address, a username, or a password. Stoifo fails to disclose that the portal server 107 of Stoifo retrieves e-mail configuration settings. In fact, the only disclosures in Stoifo relating at all to e-mail is limited to a user providing an e-mail address to identify him or herself, and the setup of a proxy e-mail address at the third party. However, neither is equivalent to retrieving e-

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Tel: 312-903-0001
Facsimile: 312-913-0002

10

mail settings from a database using the unique network address of the terminal, as required by the plain language of the claims.

Fifth, and finally, Applicants submit that the Stoifo reference fails to disclose "without sending the retrieved email configuration settings back to the terminal, to communicate with an email server using the retrieved email configuration settings."

This claim limitation gets to the heart of the difference between the currently claimed invention and the Stoifo reference. In regard to the plain language of the claim, the web server 103 of Stoifo is simply not an email server, as required by the claim.

Additionally and importantly, the proxy portal server 107 of Stoifo simply serves an entirely different purpose (to replace true user data with fake user data to allow a user to browse anonymously) than the current claimed invention (to replace default/fake user data with true user data to allow a user to send and retrieve email without the need to enter parameters at the terminal).

The email configuration settings from Applicant's invention are 'real user specific' data, which are not intended to be used for hiding the user's identity from the email server. Stoifo teaches the use of proxy identifications, intended to hide the true identity of user when accessing a webserver. This "fake" data is non-user specific, generated on the fly by a random generator (see paragraphs [0021], [0022], and [0025] of Stoifo) and may even be rotated amongst many users (see paragraph [0022] of Stoifo).

Consistent with the Stoifo disclosure, if one were to use the "fake," randomly generated identification taught by Stoifo to attempt to access a user's e-mail on an e-mail server, the e-mail server would simply reject the request as not being related to a valid account.

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Tel: 312-903-0001
Facsimile: 312-913-0002

11

For at least these reasons too, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 7, 8, and 10 be withdrawn, and these claims allowed to issue.

Specifically regarding dependent claims 4-6, and 13-15, Applicants submit that these claims are also in condition for allowance for at least the reason that these claims inherit all of the limitations of their respective base claims 1 and 10, now in condition for allowance.

Specifically regarding claim 9, Applicants submit that while Stoifo separately discloses a user computer 101, a proxy e-mail maintained at a portal 107, and the provision of a user providing an email address to identify him or herself to the portal 107, there is no disclosure in Stoifo that relates these elements in the manner recited by the Examiner to read on the limitations of claim 9. Furthermore, the Examiner can not rely upon the "assigned proxy identification" of Stoifo as being equivalent to the claimed "default configuration settings being the same for each mobile terminal operating within a network" for at least the reason that Stoifo specifically requires a unique identifier (user-provided IP address, e-mail address, etc. set forth in paragraph [0011] of Stoifo and relied upon elsewhere by the Examiner) to be provided by the user terminal to the portal 107.

For at least this reason also, Applicants submit that claim 9 is in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claim be allowed to issue.

In specific regard to the Examiner's rejection of claims 2-3 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Stoifo and AAPA, Applicants submit that the references can not be combined in the manner asserted by the Examiner. As set forth by the Federal Circuit in In re Gordon, an obviousness rejection is improper if "the proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose." *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Stoifo is directed to replacing "true" user information with

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Tel: 312-903-0001
Facsimile: 312-913-0002

12

fake/randomly generated non-user specific data (see paragraphs [0021], [0022], and [0025] of Stoifo). Accordingly, inserting AAPA parameters of a true user name and password in order to retrieve e-mail would render Stoifo unsatisfactory for its intended purpose.

For at least this reason, Applicants submit that the Examiner can not establish a prima facie case of obviousness in view of Stoifo and AAPA. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's rejection be withdrawn, and claims 2-3 and 11-12 allowed to issue.

4. Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance over the cited art of record and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance.

Should the Examiner have any questions about this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (312) 913-2125.

Respectfully submitted,
McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP

Date: <u>September 11, 2009</u>   By: <u>/Daniel R. Bestor/</u>
Daniel R. Bestor
Reg. No. 58,439

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Tel: 312-903-0001
Facsimile: 312-913-0002

13